



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ATTIC BUILDING ACCOUNTS

IV. THE STATUE OF ATHENA PROMACHOS¹

THE earliest of the extant building accounts from the Acropolis at Athens is that known as *I. G. I*, 284–288, formerly supposed to be the record of the Parthenon, or possibly of the Odeum.² This now appears on three fragments of marble, herein designated as A (*I. G. I*, 284–285), B (286–287), and C (288); though at first published separately, they were soon identified by Kirchhoff as belonging to a single construction. While this unity of subject is now generally accepted, it has not been so certain that all belong to a single stele,³ nor is their order indisputable. Kirchhoff placed C last, because of a blank space of 0.15 m. at the bottom,⁴ but there would still remain two possible orders, ABC or BAC.

The necessity for a restudy of this inscription becomes more pronounced when we observe that there exist at least three other fragments which may be assigned to it, on the basis of uniformity in shape and size of letters and spacing of lines, and the characteristic horizontal strokes separating the sums of money. These may be known as D (*I. G. I*, 545),⁵ E (545 a), and F (unpublished).⁶

¹ Three earlier articles of this series were published in this JOURNAL, Vol. XVII, 1913, pp. 53–80, 242–265, 371–398, pls. II–IV. In the fifth and concluding article I shall present some important modifications of the results which I obtained eight years ago.

² Kirchhoff, *Memorie dell' Inst.* 1865, pp. 129–142; Michaelis, *Parthenon*, pp. 287–288; Kirchhoff in the *Corpus* withdrew the attribution to the Parthenon.

³ Kirchhoff evidently assumed that they belonged to a single stone; Lørfeld (*Handbuch d. att. Inschriften*, p. 45) suggests that perhaps they are from different blocks; Cavaignac (*Études sur l'Histoire Financière d'Athènes*, p. xlviii) says that "these fragments certainly belong to two different stones."

⁴ The original bottom of the stele is not preserved.

⁵ I now learn that Bannier (*Berl. Phil. W.* 1916, p. 160) has erroneously assigned *I. G. I*, 545 to the much later *I. G. I*, 319, referring to the Theseum (*R. Ét. Gr.* 1916, p. 439).

⁶ Inv. 1335 of the Acropolis; 0.075 m. high, 0.075 m. wide, and 0.045 m. thick, with the left edge preserved, elsewhere broken; now in the Epigraphical Museum, where it was once cemented to E.

The reason for which some have assumed that A, B, and C belong to different stelae is the existence of a peculiar fracture appearing on the bottom of A and the top of B, where they were split along a mica vein running almost horizontally across the stele, sloping down toward the left at a rate of 0.0025 m. in 0.11 m., and up toward the back at a rate of 0.01 m. in 0.11 m. The split surface is so clean that at first glance it was taken for a worked joint,¹ and the pieces were thought to be separate blocks. But since the same fracture appears on both A and B, proving that these two fragments belong to a single stone, there remains no ground for assigning the fragments to more than one stele.

Fragment A preserves the right edge of the stele,² though perhaps not the right edge of the inscription, for an anathyrosis, 0.06 m. wide, seems to indicate that it was adjoined by another stele, like the Erechtheum accounts of 409/408 B.C. It now contains twelve lines (numbered 1-12), of which three are blank (ll. 4, 7, 11). Fragment B, broken on all sides, cannot be placed directly under A, in spite of the similarity of the split surface, because it would be physically impossible to space the lines evenly across the fracture, or to align the left edges of the lines. Moving B to the left, following the given slope of the horizontal fracture, a width of about 0.57 m. would be required to give a drop of one line (0.0135 m.); it is evident that we are concerned with two separate item columns, and that the topmost extant line of B must be numbered 14, counting from the top of A. Fragment B in turn contains nineteen lines (ll. 14-32), of which five are blank in the portion preserved (ll. 16, 21, 23, 29, 30).

Michaelis had suggested that the T in the last line of B might be combined with the T in the first line of C to form the word $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\tau[\acute{\alpha}]\tau[αι]$; this suggestion is now confirmed by the fact that the fractures join accurately in such a way that B contains the second, and C the first T, of $[\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\tau[\acute{\alpha}]\tau[αι]]$. Fragment C therefore continues B, and its twenty-two extant lines may be numbered 32-53, of which four are blank (ll. 38, 40, 46, 48). Below the last line appears, as we noted, a blank space of 0.15 m., extending to the present broken bottom. The total height of the three com-

¹ Kirchhoff stated that the bottom of A seemed to be cut; he expressed a similar doubt with regard to the top of B (*Corpus*).

² Kirchhoff (*Memorie*, p. 130) and Michaelis (*Parthenon*, p. 287) state that it is broken on all sides; Kirchhoff (*Corpus*) later implied, and Bannier (*Rhein. Mus.* 1906, p. 218) stated, that the right edge was preserved.

bined fragments is 0.86 m. Though the order of the three fragments from top to bottom is ABC, yet, on account of the arrangement in two columns, we must read them in the order BCA.

Turning to the three new fragments, we observe that D likewise forms the end of a column, with 0.185 m. of blank space below the last line, a fact which associates it with C. Furthermore, in lines 43 and 51 of C (the third and eleventh above the bottom), the restoration proposed below leaves two or three empty letter spaces at the beginning; this circumstance is explained by D, where in the third and eleventh lines above the bottom the sums of money are so long that they overlap the space assigned to the item column. And the single letters remaining in the various lines of D may be satisfactorily restored to fit the items of C, though the two fragments are actually separated by a gap of 0.10 m. Fragment D, therefore, contains parts of lines 43-53 of the inscription. Now the left edge of D extends 0.035 m. to the left of the money column and is there broken off; but E and F show a finished left edge only 0.006 m. to the left of the money column. We are, therefore, to assume that the stele contained three double columns, and that B+C+D formed the central column, while E and F come either from the first column of the stele or from the first column of a second stele which adjoined the anathyrosis on A. It seems better to assign E and F to the first column of this stele, since as yet we have no evidence that the stone at the right of A was part of the same inscription. The two pieces contain no evidence as to their position in the column, but they fit together, F above E.¹ It is impossible to number the lines with relation to the four larger fragments.

The customary subdivision of the columns into separate money and item columns obtains also in the present example, and forms the basis for the estimate of the total width of the stele. The width of the last item column (on A), restoring the missing letters, was 0.285 m. (measured from the right edge of the stele); the money column on D is 0.08 m. wide; we may assume that the width of any double column was about 0.365 m. Three double columns give a total width of about 1.10 m. The thickness of the stone, as given by B, is 0.253 m. The height, as determined from the number of lines required for the restoration, was greater than 1.15 m.

The relation of the sums to the entries requires special notice.

¹ Though I found them separate, they had formerly been cemented together.

In fragment A the money column must have been placed at the left of the item column, since the latter is at the right edge of the stele. In B we seem at first glance to have the opposite arrangement, with the sums at the right of the entries.¹ But closer examination reveals the fact that the items and the sums of money do not correspond. In lines 19–20 the total of wages for this year would be but slightly more than 150 drachmae; and in lines 25–27 appears a single large sum which is opposite both the entry ἐς ποικιλίαν and the total expenditure for the year. These sums cannot belong to the items on B, and must, therefore, be connected with other items, now lost, at the right, in direct continuation of A; the sums for the items mentioned on B were actually at the left. This is now proved by the junction of D to C, and by the fact that on E + F the sums of money begin at the left edge of the stele.

The accounts are arranged year by year, dated by means of the annual *epistatai* and their secretary, while at the end of each account appears the running number of the year since the beginning of the work. Since a complete year (on B + C + D) occupied only twenty-three lines, with a spacing of 0.0135 m., and since the total number of lines was considerably greater than fifty-three, we must assume that there were at least three and possibly four years in each column. The only numeral now preserved is [δγδ]οον in Column III, line 6.² The space below this (corresponding to forty-seven lines of Column II) would be exactly filled by the accounts of two years, if the work lasted so long; only the beginning of the ninth account is preserved (ll. 8–12). Above fragment A, in Column III, must have appeared also the seventh account, since in the last line of Column II there are only six letter spaces for the numeral, requiring [ἑκτ]ον.³ Each of Columns I and II, therefore, contained the accounts of three years.

The relative order of these six fragments is now fixed. We should read the text, with restorations, as follows.

¹ Kirchhoff (*Memorie*, pp. 137–140) calculated the amounts of the expenses on this principle; Michaelis (*Parthenon*, p. 287) compared this peculiarity with the quota lists of 454/3; cf. Bannier, *Rhein. Mus.* 1906, pp. 218–219; with this I formerly agreed (*A. J. A.* 1913, p. 59 n. 1), before I had made a study of the fragment.

² See the commentary on this line.

³ See the commentary on this line.

Column I, fragments F + E (11 lines):

Δ Γ Η

⌘MMX
ΔΔΔΗΙΙΙ

5

⌘X⌘⌘ΔΔ
ΠΗΗΠ

Η⌘ΔΔΔΔ Γ Η . .

MMMXXXX

10

⌘HHH⌘Η

⌘XHHH⌘ . .

Column II, ll. 14–53, fragments B + C + D:

15

[? Ἀνελόσαμεν τῷ ἔργ]οι
[. ἐς οἶκο]δομίαν
[κα . . .
[ἄνθρακες καὶ χσύλα κ]αύσιμα

20

[μισθοὶ καθεμέραν μισ]θοὶ κατα
[μένα ἀ]πόπαχς

25

[μισθοὶ ἐπιστάτεσι κ]αὶ γρα[μμ]
[ατῇ ἐν τούτοι ἔτει]
[ἀργύριον ἄσεμον ἐς] ποικιλί
[αν τῷ
[κεφάλαιον ἀναλόματ]ος

30

[περιεγένετο τῷ λέμμ]ατος
[κατὰ τὸ πέμπτον ἔτος]

35

[Ἐπὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς ἡεὶ : ἐγραμμ]άτευ[ε]
[. : ἐπισ]τ[ά]τ[αι]
[λέμματα παρὰ κολα]κρετ[ὸν]
[λέμμα περιγενό]μενο[ν]
[ἐκ τῷ προτέρο ἐν]ιαυτῷ
[.]ρα
[. : [ΔΤΤΤΤ ε[. . .

[. τάλ]αντα: ⌘ΤΤΤ

40

[? 'Ανελόσαμε]ν τῷ ἔργο[ι]

[. ἐς οἶκ]οδομίαν κα[. . .

. . . . ΔΔΔΓΙ [ἄνθρακες κ]αὶ χύλα κα[ύσιμα]

. . . ΠΗΗ μ[ισθοὶ καθεμέ]ραν μισθοὶ κ[αταμένια]

45

τα[.] ἀπόπαχς

. . ΔΓΤ μ[όλυβδος ?]

. ΗΗΠΔΔΔ ἀ[ργύριον ἄσεμ]ον ἐς ποι[κιλίαν]

. ΗΙ τῷ[.

50

ΧΠΗΗΗΗ μ[ισθοὶ ἐπιστ]άτεσι κα[ὶ γραμμα]

ΠΔΤΤΗΙ τ[εῖ ἐν τούτοι] ἔτει

ΜΧΧΗΗΔΓΤΤ [κεφάλαιον] ἀναλόματ[ος]

ΠΗΗΠΔΔΔ π[εριεγένετ]ο τῷ λέμματ[ος]

. . Ι κ[ατὰ τὸ ἑκτ]ον ἔτος

Column III, ll. 1–28, fragments A + B:

[μισθοὶ ἐπιστάτε]σι καὶ γρ[α]

[μματῇ ἐν τούτ]ο[ι] ἔτει

[κεφάλαιον ἀν]αλόματος

5

[περιεγένετ]ο τῷ λέμματος

[κατὰ τὸ ὀγδ]οον ἔτος

[Ἐπὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς ἡῖ]ς: ἐγραμμάτενε

[.]ν: ἐπιστάται

10

[λέμματα πα]ρὰ κολακρετῶν

[λῆμμα περιγ]εν[όμεν]ον: ἐ[κ τῷ]

[προτέρω ἐν]ιαυτῷ

15

ΧΗ

ΗΗ

ΔΓ

ΗΓ

20

—

—

—

—

25 M
 H
 Δ

 X

I add a few comments on the restorations which differ from those finally published by Kirchhoff (*I. G. I.*, 284–288, 545):

Column II:

L. 14—*δνεμάτων* or *μισθομάτων* τῶι ἔργῳι, Bannier (*Rhein. Mus.* 1906, p. 218); I have suggested that it is rather the heading for the expenses.

L. 15–16—see line 42.

L. 17—*ἄνθρακες*; charcoal appears together with firewood in *I. G. I.*, 319, line 14, and exactly fills the space here.

L. 19–20—*καθ' ἡμέραν* μισθοὶ κατὰ [τὰ εἰρεμένα ἀ]πόπαχς, Kirchhoff; cf. Meisterhans (*Grammatik*³, p. 148), Herwerden (*Lexicon*, s.v. ἀπόπαξ), and Bannier (*loc. cit.*); but it does not fit the space.

L. 22–23—see lines 1–2; Michaelis suggested κεφάλαιον ζ]οιγρά[φοις.

L. 24–25—see lines 47–48; Michaelis suggested κεφάλαιον] ποικιλ[ταῖς.

L. 29—no space is left for this line in the *Corpus*; πέμπτον restored for reasons given below (line 53).

L. 34—Kirchhoff read the four extant letters γενο.

L. 37–39—Pittakys (Ἐφ. Ἀρχ. 1859, No. 3481) represented a second Δ in line 37; Michaelis and Cavaignac (*loc. cit.* p. 75) state that these (31) 21 talents are receipts, but since sums of money would hardly be mingled with the items, it seems more probable that these are the weights of some superfluous material, such as metal, which was sold.

L. 43—see line 17; the indentation of the item column by three spaces is required by fragment D.

L. 45—ἀπόταχσ[ω], Kirchhoff (*Memorie*, p. 139).

L. 47—I shall attempt later to justify this restoration of the words α ον.

L. 51—the indentation of the item column by two spaces is required by fragment D.

L. 53—fragment C almost immediately precedes A, of the eighth year; and there are only six spaces for the numeral, so that *ἡέβδομον*, *πέμπτον*, etc. are excluded. Köhler suggested that the first letter was B.

Column III:

L. 1—ΞΙΚΑΙΓ, Kirchhoff (*Memorie*, p. 130), evidently a typographical error (Pittakys, Ἐφ. Ἀρχ. 1860, No. 4087, had ΞΙΚΑΙΑ); because of it Michaelis restored *σι καὶ π[οικιλ] . .*; Kirchhoff later corrected it to *ἐπιστάτε]σι καὶ γ . .*; Bannier suggests *λῆμμα τοῖς ἐπιστάτε]σι κα ἔτει* (*Rhein. Mus.* 1906, p. 218).

L. 2—Pittakys did not see these erased letters; Köhler read merely ΤΕ (*Corpus*); the erasure seems to imply that this was only a partial payment of the salaries, or that it included part of the amount due the preceding year.

L. 6—ON, Pittakys, and Kirchhoff restored $\delta\gamma\delta\lambda\omicron\omicron\nu$, which was accepted by Michaelis; later Köhler read merely ON, and Kirchhoff restored $\kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha}$ τὸ . . . λον ἔτος; the curve of the first O actually appears.

L. 8—one of the formulae suggested by Kirchhoff (*Memorie*, p. 134), except that there is not space (as we learn from fragment D) for the number of the ἀρχῆ.

L. 9—probably three epistatae were named; Bannier supposes that the epistatae were not named, and that they were permanent (*Rhein. Mus.* 1906, p. 217).

L. 10—the plural λέμματα restored to fill the space.

Ll. 12–13—the formula restored by Bannier (*Rhein. Mus.* 1906, p. 217 n. 3), except that I add λέμματα to fill the space.

Since 1873, when the attribution to the Parthenon was definitely abandoned by Kirchhoff, there has been no attempt to identify the construction to which the inscription refers. In the absence of the main prescript, our only evidence is the date as determined from the forms of the letters, the location as implied or suggested by the place of discovery, the estimated duration and cost of the work, and various hints afforded by the items of expenditure.

In the text, the absence of allusions to particular parts of a building, or to processes of construction, is particularly noteworthy; we find merely the general expression ἐς οἰκοδομίαν, “for the erecting,” which evidently formed a very small part of the expenditure. The only other items which appeared in the fifth and sixth years, besides salaries and wages, are peculiarly significant. One of these items, apparently an annual entry, appears in these two years (Col. II, ll. 17, 43) as [. κ]αύσιμα, or [. κ]αὶ χσύλα κα[ύσιμα]; both phrases are the same, and I have suggested that the first eight spaces were filled by the single word ἄνθρακες, on the analogy of *I. G.* I, 319, line 14 (χσύλα καὶ ἄνθρακες τοῖ μολύβδοι). In this other inscription the charcoal and firewood are recorded as having been bought for the melting of the metal for casting the accessories of the bronze statues in the Hephaestum. It is tempting to assume that the fuel was intended also in our own case for the casting of a bronze statue. Then it would be possible to explain another item which appears in these two years (Col. II, ll. 24–25 and 47–48): [.] ποικιλί[αν] or ἀ[.]ον ἐς ποικιλίαν τῷ [.] respectively. It obviously relates to the purchase of some material for use in decoration. For work in bronze such an accessory material would naturally be silver,

the decoration (ποικιλία) then being in the form of chasing or inlaying. This interpretation seems to be confirmed by the fact that the space would be exactly filled by the two words ἀ[ργύριον ἄσεμ]ον.

A bronze statue which took at least nine years to build must have been of colossal size. Among bronze statues, it is recorded that the Colossus of Rhodes by Chares required twelve years for its construction, the Mercury by Zenodorus ten years,¹ and the two comparatively small cult statues by Alcamenes in the Hephaestum at least five years.²

It is possible to form an approximate estimate of the expenses for the sixth year, by filling out the gaps in the sums of money, as follows:

(928)	for building (remainder from total given below).
385½	for fuel (minimum allowance).
7700	for wages (the other possibility, 3700, is too small).
76	for lead (? or 36, 126, or 166).
382½	for silver (minimum allowance).
1963½	for salaries (amount preserved).
11434½	total expenditure.
782½	surplus (amount preserved).
12217	total receipts (amount preserved).

The sums for the ninth year seem to have been of similar amounts; the few traces preserved on fragment B are of small quantities (1100+, 215+, and 150+), and then at the end (ll. 25–28) appear two larger sums, probably the total receipts (10110+) and the surplus (1000+), so that the total expenditure would have been somewhat more or less than 9110 drachmae. In one of the first three years, on fragments F+E, larger sums are involved, in one case 71036½+, in another 34,807 drachmae; even if we place these on opposite sides of the account, assuming that the former was part of the receipts and the latter part of the expenses, it is clear that the operations may have attained a total as great as 100,000 drachmae. We might estimate, therefore, that the average for the nine years was about 55,000 drachmae, giving for the total cost of the statue about 500,000 drachmae or 83 talents, a sum which would imply that the dimensions were colossal.

¹ Pliny, *N. H.* XXXIV, 41, 44.

² *I. G. I.*, 318–319.

From the location of the fragments at the time of their discovery, we must assume that the stele, and, therefore, probably the statue, were set up on the Acropolis.

The form of the letter Σ would place the inscription earlier than 447/6 B.C., when the Parthenon was begun; yet the letters are not archaic, so that the work is clearly post-Persian, probably slightly earlier than the middle of the century.¹

A colossal bronze statue, erected on the Acropolis shortly before the middle of the fifth century, at a cost of about 85 talents, can hardly have been other than the great bronze statue of Athena (the Promachos) by Phidias.

I am aware that in making this identification I am but adding another uncertainty to the many with which the Athena Promachos is surrounded. Date, size, and pose are all as yet undecided. With the pose we are not concerned; but the most reasonable estimates with regard to size and date seem to confirm the evidence of the inscription.

The colossal height of 70 to 80 feet including the pedestal, as suggested by Leake, Cockerell, Beulé, Penrose, Pennethorne, and many others,² is certainly excessive. On the other hand, those who would reduce it to 30 feet including the pedestal, as Michaelis, Milchhöfer, Bötticher, Overbeck, Gurlitt, Collignon, Frazer, Lechat, Gardner, and others,³ are surely too conservative.

¹ Michaelis (*Parthenon*, p. 287) dated it earlier than 436/5; Kirchhoff placed it before 438/7 (*Memorie*, p. 133), and afterwards before 444/3 (*Corpus*); Larfeld places it between 480 and 445 (*Handbuch*, p. 440), or at least before 444/3 (*ibid.* p. 45); Bannier (*Rhein. Mus.* 1908, p. 429) assigns it to about 446/5 B.C.

² Leake, *Topography of Athens*, 1st ed., p. 243 n. 1 and plates, 2nd ed., p. 351; Beulé, *Acropolis*, II, p. 308; Pennethorne, *Geometry and Optics*, p. 35, pl. V; Dyer, *Athens*, p. 437; Penrose, *Athenian Architecture*, 2nd ed., p. x; Harrison, *Studies in Greek Art*, p. 201.

³ Michaelis, *Ath. Mitt.* 1877, pp. 89-90; Milchhöfer, in Baumeister, *Denkmäler*, p. 208, and Waldstein, *ibid.*, p. 1311; Bötticher, *Akropolis*, p. 96; Overbeck, *Gr. Plastik*, 4th ed., I, p. 348; Collignon, *Sculpture Gr.* I, p. 524; Blümner, *Pausanias*, I, p. 303; Busolt, *Gr. Gesch.* III, p. 449 n.; Lechat, *Phidias*, p. 75; Fougères, *Grèce*, p. 44; Hadaczek, *R. Ét. Gr.* 1913, p. 21. A fanciful identification of a bronze Athena at Constantinople with the Promachos has been adduced as evidence for this height; see Gurlitt, *Analecta Graecensia*, 1893, pp. 101-121; Jones, *Select Passages*, pp. 78-80; Frazer, *Pausanias*, II, pp. 349-350; Gardner, *Greek Sculpture*, 2nd ed., p. 281 n. 2; Gardner, *Ancient Athens*, p. 213; Gardner, *Six Greek Sculptors*, p. 88; Michaelis, *Arx Athenarum*, pp. 76-77; Judeich, *Topographie*, pp. 101, 216 n.; D'Ooge, *Acropolis*, p. 299; Weller, *Athens*, p. 344.

A better estimate is that of Reisch,¹ based on the dimensions of the foundations, giving 30 cubits. For the pedestal is 5.58 m. square on the euthynteria and 5.28 m. square on the lowest finished course, implying, if we use the approximate ratio 1:3.1 found in other colossi of this period (Athena Parthenos, base 4.096 m. and height 12.75 m., *i.e.* 26 cubits; Apollo Sitalcas, base 4.96 m. and height 15.50 m., *i.e.* 35 cubits), a height of about 16.40 m. or 50 Attic feet including the pedestal. Such a height would bring the crest of the helmet 10 metres below the summit of the pediments of the Parthenon and 6 metres above the summit of the Propylaea. We may assume that the pedestal was about 8 Attic feet in height;



FIGURE 1.—CAPPING COURSE OF PEDESTAL.²

this satisfies the requirements of the few scattered architectural fragments, belonging to a Pentelic marble capping course $1\frac{1}{2}$ Attic feet (0.485 m.) high, carved with a colossal bead-and-reel and egg-and-dart, surmounted by a plain abacus from which the plinth of the statue receded 0.235 m. (Fig. 1),³ and to a die of Eleusinian

¹ Reisch, *Jh. Oest. Arch. I.*, 1906, p. 221.

² Adapted from a photograph of the German Archaeological Institute at Athens, Akr. 662. This block, lying on the site itself, is 1.234 m. long and 0.489 m. high; of the latter dimension the beads occupy 0.081 m., the eggs 0.207 m., the abacus 0.201 m.; the eggs are spaced 0.308 m. on centres. A similar block, 0.482 m. high, is now in the Library of Hadrian, and a fragment in the Acropolis Museum (annex).

³ This capping course was erroneously assigned by Penrose to the cornice of the temple of Zeus Olympius; see *Transactions Royal Inst. Brit. Architects*, 1888, pp. 98, 102; *Athenian Architecture*, 2nd ed., p. 86.

limestone. Then the statue would have been about 42 Attic feet, less, as we should expect, than the Apollo of Calamis at Apollonia, which held the record of 45 feet for the fifth century.¹

At a time when an ordinary portrait statue of life size, or more strictly heroic size (6 Attic feet, 1.96 m.), must have cost about a quarter of a talent,² a colossal statue of seven times life size would have required, according to the law of Sextus Empiricus, the expenditure of about 85 talents.³

As for the date of the Athena Promachos, we have no valid reason for dissenting from the view usually accepted, that it should be assigned to the Cimonian period, the decade before the ostracism of Cimon (461 B.C.).⁴ It would then be the earliest of the three great colossal statues designed by Phidias, all with bases of white Pentelic marble and black Eleusinian limestone, evidently the result of the collaboration of Ictinus: (1) the Athena Promachos, 465-456 B.C.; (2) the Zeus at Olympia, 456-447 B.C.⁵; and (3) the Athena Parthenos, 447-438 B.C.

WILLIAM BELL DINSMOOR.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.
NEW YORK

¹ Pliny, *N. H.* XXXIV, 39-45, a chronological list of record-breaking colossi.

² The price in the Hellenistic period was twice as much, a half talent; see A. de Ridder, *R. Arch.* 1915², p. 97.

³ See de Ridder, *loc. cit.*; the height, 7 (in terms of life-size statues), is cubed and then multiplied by $\frac{1}{4}$ talent (the value of one life-size statue).

⁴ The objections to this view, and the later dates proposed, are all based on untenable hypotheses. (1) Phidias was supposed by Müller (*Werke*, II, p. 17) to have died leaving it unfinished, since the shield was wrought by Mys and Parrhasius. (2) An extant inscription was supposed by Kirchhoff (*I. G. I.*, 333) to have formed the dedication of the base, with letters too late for the Cimonian period; but it has been proved that the letters are too early, rather than too late, for the Cimonian period, and that the stone is in any case too small to have formed part of the base. (3) The Medici torso, of a style as late as 445 B.C. at least, was supposed by Lange and others to be a copy of the Athena Promachos.

⁵ This date of the Olympian Zeus agrees best with the building accounts of the Parthenon; see A. J. A. 1913, p. 71. The work of Ictinus at Olympia during this period is discussed in my *Culmination of Greek Architecture in the Age of Pericles*, to be published by the Metropolitan Museum of Art.